

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please substitute the enclosed copy of Figure 7 for the one now in the application.

Remarks/Arguments

The original claims 1 to 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Bowman, et al., patent #6,169,986.

In the present application, failed search queries are analyzed in a self enhancing search system to improve results. This self-enhancement search system includes a search system log analyzer, which periodically looks through the search system log, of a database, for unsuccessful search queries that did not turn up a sufficient number of references or documents: a relevant document finder which, based on enhanced query terms and their categorization and subject, uncovers relevant documents that were not found by the unsuccessful search queries and a meta data enhancer, that enhances the textual index for the relevant documents based on the enhanced query terms in the search index, to allow the relevant documents turned up by the enhanced query to be returned when future searches similar to the unsuccessful search queries are entered by users.

The Bowman patent does not teach searching for analyzing search queries that do not bring satisfactory results. In fact in a number of places, it teaches ignoring unsatisfactory searches. For instance, beginning on line 66 of column 9 and continuing onto lines 1 to 7 of column 10, it calls for extracting successful queries and ignoring failed queries to prevent non-matching terms from being added to the correlation table. Further, applicant's attorney did not find in the section cited for that purpose (column 14 lines 26 to 43) where terms of unsatisfied search queries are added to documentation missed by that query.

The claims in the application recite limitations that reflect the differences in the present application and the Bowman patent. For instance, all independent claims call for an analyzer that selects unsatisfactory searches for analysis. Independent claims 9 and 17 recite unsatisfactory search results as those that cite less than a specified number of references. For this and other reasons, all claims in the application clearly distinguish over the prior art.

### Rejection Under 35 USC 112

The applicant has modified the claims to overcome the deficiencies cited by the Examiner under the basis of 35 USC 112. The applicant's attorney has gone over the claims for any other deficiencies.

### The Specification

Mediums used in storing computer programs are well known. Requiring that say a "electrostatic" or "magna static" medium must be specified is akin to requiring the type of tire, say radial or 4-ply, be specified when tires are recited as parts of a claim covering an automobile. "Brief Description of the Invention" specification has been amended by specifying that the elements of the automatic search under meta-data systems are "computer program modules on a computer usable medium". This does not constitute new matter since, as the Examiner points out, this is recited in the claims.

CHA920030010US1

**The Claims**

The errors mentioned in the rejection have been corrected. The applicant's attorney has gone over the claims for any other necessary corrections.

**The Drawings**

The substitution of Figure 7 has been made to correct the misspelling of the word – textual – in box 700.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

An Information Disclosure Statement has been included, as required by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable, and therefore it is requested that the application be reconsidered, allowed and passed to issued.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

  
James E. Murray - Attorney

Registration No.: 20,915

Phone: (845) 462-4763